

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21, are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17 are amended herein. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments, and the new grounds of rejection. Further consideration is requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,629,316 to Curtis (hereinafter "Curtis") in view of US Patent No. 6,952,479 to Shavit et al. ("Shavit"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended.

The sixth clause of claim 1 recites:

Wherein the script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files.

Neither Curtis nor Shavit teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files," as recited in claim 1. In Curtis, rather, the script file *contains* the values. In particular, as described in the Abstract.

A script file, containing properties and associated values that are to be used by the program on a specific operating system, is created.

Since the script file in Curtis contains the values, Curtis shows no "the script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files," as recited in claim 1.

Shavit shows no "script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files" either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Curtis with respect to claim 1.

The seventh clause of claim 1 recites:

The script is encrypted.

Curtis neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "the script is encrypted," as recited in claim 1. Curtis, in fact, mentions no encryption at all. The Office Action acknowledges graciously

in section 6, at the bottom of page 4, that "Curtis fails to specifically teach the script being encrypted and a module decrypting the script," and attempts to compensate for this deficiency of Curtis by combining Curtis with Shavit, asserting further in section 6, at the top of page 5, that:

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having both teaching before him/her at the time of the invention to feature script being encrypted and a module decrypting the script, in combination with the information processing method by Curtis because the result would have prevented a hacker from discovering or tampering with algorithms that are used in the copy protection applied by the module, as taught by Shavit (Col. 18, Lines 1-12).

Curtis, however, uses human readable logs for both the install and uninstall processes. The logs are human readable to allow them to be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully. In particular, as described at column 5, lines 48-51:

Logs are used for both the install and uninstall process. Furthermore, these logs are human readable which allows them to be checked, e.g., after a silent install, to ensure that a file has installed successfully.

If the logs were encrypted, on the other hand, as proposed in the Office Action, they would not be human readable. If the logs were encrypted, in particular, they could not be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully, which is what Curtis wants to be able to do. Curtis, consequently, would not want "the script is encrypted," as recited in claim 1, since then the logs could not be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully. It is submitted, therefore, that persons of ordinary skill in the art who read Curtis at the time of the invention would not have been motivated to modify Curtis as proposed in the Office Action, since then the logs could not be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully.

Modifying Curtis as proposed in the Office Action, moreover, would render Curtis unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of allowing the logs to be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully. As provided in the M.P.E.P § 2143.01:

If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Since modifying Curtis as proposed in the Office Action would render Curtis unsatisfactory for its intended purpose of allowing the logs to be checked to ensure that a file has installed successfully, there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*. Claim 1 is thus submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the

rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 4, and 18 depend from claim 1 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 2, 4, and 18 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 4, and 18 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, and 21:

The sixth and seventh clauses of claims 5, 9, and 13 recite substantially:

Wherein the script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files,
The script is encrypted.

Neither Curtis nor Shavit teaches, discloses, nor suggests "wherein the script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

Persons of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, moreover, would not have been motivated to modify Curtis so that "the script is encrypted," as also discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claims 5, 9, and 13 are submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 9, and 13 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, and 21 depend from claim 5, claim 9, or claim 13 and add additional distinguishing elements. Claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, and 21 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, and 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 17:

The second clause of claim 17 recites:

Encrypting a script.

Persons of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to modify Curtis for "encrypting a script," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The seventh clause of claim 17 recites:

Wherein the script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files.

Application Serial No. 10/630,714
Amendment filed August 12, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed March 17, 2009

Neither Curtis nor Shavit teaches, discloses, nor suggests, "wherein the script and the values of the parameters are stored in separate files," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 17 is thus submitted to be allowable as well, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16-21 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing this Amendment, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 12, 2009

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501